Message
_____

From:	Nordine, John [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=6F082FB004BA4D818FE3276686C84C63-JNORDINE]
Sent:	7/20/2017 3:16:47 PM
To:	Gerry Ruopp [gerry.ruopp@centralwire.com]
Subject:	RE: June 2017 Monthly Progress Report for the Techalloy/Central Wire facility in Union, Illinois

Gerry,

No third comment, I messed up on the numbering.
No attachment was received with this email.

Thanks,

John Nordine

_____

From: Gerry Ruopp [mailto:gerry.ruopp@centralwire.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2017 10:12 AM
To: Nordine, John <nordine.john@epa.gov>
Cc: Bob Kay <rtkay@usgs.gov>; Jack Thorsen <jack@autumnwoodesh.com>; Stillman, Sarah <Stillman.Sarah@epa.gov>; Robert Johnson <robert.johnson@centralwire.com>; Gerry Ruopp <gerry.ruopp@centralwire.com>
Subject: RE: June 2017 Monthly Progress Report for the Techalloy/Central Wire facility in Union, Illinois

John –
In responses to your comments:
1.) Sorry, I missed attaching the Testamerica laboratory report. See attached.
2.) I had planned on sending you the June semi-annual sampling results with the July report. However, I will send them to you with our responses to your comments.
3.) ?
4.) and 5.) I will get with Jack Thorsen and revise report and data.

Sincerely,
Gerry Ruopp

_____

From: Nordine, John [mailto:nordine.john@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2017 9:51 AM
To: Gerry Ruopp
Cc: Bob Kay; Jack Thorsen; Stillman, Sarah
Subject: June 2017 Monthly Progress Report for the Techalloy/Central Wire facility in Union, Illinois

Mr. Ruopp,

EPA has reviewed the June 2017 Monthly Progress Report for the Techalloy/Central Wire facility in Union, Illinois. I only have a few comments.

1. The laboratory report with the sampling results is not included in this submission. It should be provided.

2. The boilerplate describing the routine monitoring of the monitoring and residential wells indicates they should have been sampled in June. The text notes well DGW-2I was sampled, which implies the other wells were sampled, but is hardly explicit. If these wells were sampled in June, the text should explicitly note the sampling event occurred, along with when the data and analysis will be provided to EPA. If these wells were not sampled, the text should explain why they weren't, and when the sampling will occur.

4. Rather than averaging water-level data for the period when the transducer was out of the hole, the data for that time period should be left off of the plot. Provide a new plot of the data.

5. CW provides the results of the most recent sampling data from the extraction wells. A couple sentences describing the results (things are pretty much unchanged or the change is...) should be provided. EPA notes the part of the plume (partly?) intercepting by pumping at EW-2 seems to be experiencing less degradation and has more TCE and PCE.

Please provide EPA with a response in 30-days. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully,

John Nordine, CPG, LPG
U.S. EPA, Region 5
RCRA Corrective Action Section
77 W. Jackson Blvd. LU-16J
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Phone: 312-353-1243
Fax: 312-385-5338

"The great end of education is to discipline rather than finish the mind; to train it to use of its own powers rather than to fill it with the accumulation of others." Tryon Edwards
"Don't interfere with anything in the Constitution. That must be maintained, for it is the only safeguard of our liberties." Abraham Lincoln
"Many people use statistics in the same manner in which a drunk uses a lamp post; for support, rather than for illumination." Mark Twain